



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,652

09/27/2006

Christian Belouet

979-257

1603

39600

7590

04/11/2012

SOFER & HAROUN LLP.

317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910

NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER

KUNEMUND, ROBERT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/11/2012

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,652	BELOUET, CHRISTIAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M. Kunemund	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-33 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-832) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukuda et al (6,946,029) in view of Belouet EP 0079567

The Tsukuda et al reference teaches a method of creating a patterned layer, note entire reference. A support is patterned into a variety of different shapes, note figures. The support can be graphite carbon or silicon nitride. Onto this support face, silicon is deposited onto it. The silicon will take the complementary shape of the patterned support. The silicon then is removed from the support eliminating the support and creating a ribbon with a shape, note examples. The sole difference between the instant

Art Unit: 1714

claims and the prior art is the removal step and carbon strip. The EP 0079567 reference teaches using carbon strips and removal of them from the grown silicon ribbon, note abs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tsukuda et al reference by the teachings of the EP 0079567 to use carbon and remove in order to remove without damaging the pattern that has been created.

Claims 4, 6 to 8, and 28 to 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukuda et al (6,946,029) in view of Belouet (EP 0079567).

The Tsukuda et al reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the rollers. However, the Belouet reference teaches the use of rollers to create a silicon ribbon, Note figure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tsukuda et al by the teachings of the Belouet reference to use rollers in order to increase the rate of production of the silicon.

Claims 11 to 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsukuda et al (6,946,029) in view of Belouet (EP 0079567).

The Tsukuda et al reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the thickness pattern. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable thickness and pattern in the Tsukuda et al reference in order to grow the desired shaped silicon.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 to 33 have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is (571)272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Kornakov can be reached on 571-272-1303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert M Kunemund
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

Application/Control Number: 10/594,652
Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

RMK

/Robert M Kunemund/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1714